DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 004 CS 204 654

AUTHOR Woods, William F.
TITLE Teaching Writing: The Major Theories Since 1950.
PUB DATE [78]
NOTE 27p.; Study prepared at Wichita State University

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Composition (Literary); *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; *English Instruction; Higher Education; Models; *Teaching Methods; Theories

ABSTRACT

The pendular shifts in attitudes toward teaching writing reflect varying concerns that educators have had about the proper instructional emphasis--whether it should be student centered or discipline centered. The historical dates that act as signposts to these shifting attitudes toward methods of writing instruction include the following: the founding by the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) of the Conference on College Composition and Communication in 1949; NCTE's 1956 publication of "The English Language Arts in the Secondary School," a position statement stressing the needs of the whole child; the 1957 launching of the Sputnik satellite, initiating a scrabble for educational discipline and academic reform; the 1966 Dartmouth Conference, which developed reactions to the academic reforms; and the "back to basics," movement, typifying the retrenchment of 1977-1979. Within this historical context, several writing theories, models, and activities can be discussed: the works of John Dixon and Ken Macrorie, urging student self-discovery through language experience; Robert Zoellner's "talk-write" model; Peter Elbow's "developmental" model; Francis Christensen's "Generative Rhetoric of the Sentence"; James Moffett's theory of discourse; John Mellon's tranformational generative grammar; Frank O'Hare's sentence combining; and the heuristics of Frank D'Angelo, Richard Young, and Kenneth Burke. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

William F. Woods
Department of English
Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas 67208

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William F. Woods

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED168004

CS204654

TEACHING WRITING: THE MAJOR THEORIES SINCE 1950

In 1949, the NCTE founded the Conference on College Composition and Communication, bestowing upon the college teaching of writing in America its official baptism. By that time, of course, composition was scarcely a novelty in the high schools and colleges; in fact, it had been a subject of debate since the end of the 19th century. The current thinking, inherited from the progressive movement, was something called the "life-adjustment" theory. Life-Adjustment stressed the "needs of the whole child" and sought to design the curriculum around those needs.[1] For example, in 1956, when the NCTE's curriculum commission published The English Language Arts in the Secondary School,[2] a kind of position statement, the section on composition was entitled "Meeting Youth's Needs Through Writing." Sub-heads in this chapter included "Knowledge of One's Self and Others," "Respect for the Thinking of Others," and "Observation and Organization of Experience." Following this were 15 pages on "Personal Writing," but only five pages on "Formulation of Opinion."

By the early 60's, the climate had changed. Sputnik had gone up in 1957 and a pervasive desire for achievement, discipline and academic substance swept through the schools

and colleges, motivating teachers of writing, especially, to reexamine their methods and goals. Themes, Theories, and Therapy (1963) by Albert Kitzhaber at Dartmouth College was such a critical assessment, focussing on college composition, insofar as one could focus on a discipline characterized by "vast uncertainty" in regard to fundamental theory and practice. In a general way, it was a happy time to be writing about composition. Enrollments were up, the language skills of incoming freshmen seemed to be improving, and that improvement - according to Kitzhaber - stemmed partly from better teaching in the high schools. More writing was being done in high school classes, and there had been a swing away from the whole-child, life-adjustment orientation toward greater intellectual rigor; students were becoming acquainted with subjects like the "new" (structural) English grammar and American dialects and linguistic geography.[3] On the other hand, Kitzhaber worried that unless the colleges upgraded their composition courses, major changes might be forced upon them by the high schools. These were the years of the so-called "academic reform."

A reaction against this reform soon followed, however. In 1966, and again at Dartmouth College, ironically, a group of English and American teachers met to define what they considered some necessary changes in the way English was being taught. Within a year, John Dixon, one of the confereees, had written Growth Through English (1967),[4] summing up the

recommendations of the conference. Students needed, for example, to make greater use of expressive language in their writing; they needed to become more aware of how they used language to shape their ideas; there should be more interaction in the classroom, more talk, more dramatic activities, more collaborative writing. Above all, English needed to be defined by the activities of learning rather than by the subject matter to be learned. These were some of the ideas that made the teaching of writing between 1969 and 1974 a radical undertaking in the true sense of rethinking our basic principles, our root assumptions about teaching, in order to begin again with renewed vigor and a clear vision of our goals.

Today, some ten years after the Dartmouth Conference, the attitude of English teachers is less expansive. Enrollments are down, funding is low, and freshmen seem less and less able - in short, there has been a retreat from the general permissiveness and experimentation of the late 60's and early 70's. Teachers once more regard the research paper as a useful assignment, and grammar and usage are once again respectable subjects. Still, in the midst of our retrenching, some strong liberal voices continue to be heard. In 1977, Elizabeth McPherson writes a section on "Composition" for a volume called The Teaching of English,[5] a position statement of the National Society for the Study of Education. What is the mainstream of modern composition teaching? McPherson cites the open classroom and its stress on

cooperative activities such as writing freely for a real audience of other students, collaborative editing, language games, journal writing, role playing. In general, the emphasis is on "cooperating in the process of writing," rather than on criticizing the produce. And the purpose of writing (echoing John Dixon) is to help students grow through the use of language. Here again, as in the "life-adjustment" years, the focus of the composition course is on the students themselves and their writing behavior.

This brief history suggests two insights: first, that general attitudes toward the teaching of writing tend to swing back and forth between student-centered and what I'll call discipline-centered teaching, and second, that both of these attitudes have been present concurrently - in varying ratios - throughout the last 25 years. The theories of teaching writing I am going to discuss can be placed in terms of these two attitudes, although for the last decade, most of them have inclined toward the student-centered view. This emphasis derives partly from the sustained reaction to the academic traditionalism of the early 60's, but also, I suspect, the teaching of writing is by nature a less "traditional" subject, less a "discipline" than, for example, the teaching of literature. Composition has no canon of texts, no history to speak of. The focus of its methods, materials and aims does tend to be uncertain, as Kitzhaber complained, and so the emphasis falls more naturally onto the students

themselves and their composing behavior. Quite likely, the current interest in pre-writing and invention represents only one potential development of this inherent, student-centered bias in the teaching of writing.

Ultimately, it is not certain why teachers are gradually shifting their emphasis from the teaching of organization and style to pre-writing and invention, but theorists have found the contrast enlightening. Daniel Fogarty, Robert Zoellner, and most recently, Richard Young have analyzed the differences between the product and process-based views of the composing process and concluded that each view represents a kind of conceptual frame, or "paradigm" for understanding the act of composing.[6] A new paradigm, a new perspective, is necessary for change in any art or science, because the new angle of approach reveals aspects of the subject which were simply not "visible" from the previous angle. But the old paradigm is valuable, too, since one of the best ways of creating and understanding new forms of thought is to map the blind spots and other inadequacies of the older, existing theory. What is there in the "current-traditional paradigm," as Young calls it, that the modern theorists have reacted against? Besides the emphasis on composed product rather than on the composing process, there is the analysis of discourse into words, sentences and paragraphs, instead of considering the connected argument; the classification of discourse into

description, narrative, exposition and argument; the strong concern with usage (syntax, spelling and punctuation) and with style; an emphasis on the research paper and on the informal essay; and as a corollary, the tendency to assume that "creative processes" are not susceptible to conscious control by formal procedures (Wendell Johnson once labelled this tendency the "only God can make a tree" attitude).[7]

I should add that not all the objections to the current-traditional paradigm are theoretical. One reason the paradigm maintains its hold on the imagination is that it incorporates commonsense notions about writing, giving them credibility even after they have been proved wrong by years of careful research. The teaching of grammar as a way of teaching writing is a good example; even though a multitude of studies over a period of more than seventy years have shown negative or inconclusive results,[8] teachers continue to suspect that grammar study, or "disciplined" grammar study, or perhaps "creative" grammar study will be helpful to student writers. After all, from the old perspective, from the view that writing is a product to be edited, grammar study <u>does</u> make sense.

But in 1965 when Edward Corbett brought out his <u>Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student,</u>[9] the current-traditional paradigm was yet to be born, and no one worried much about the open classroom. Classical rhetoric had substance and could be taught as an academic subject, and so it fitted well

with the prevailing idea that composition needed "content" to become a respectable college course. Yet there were considerable differences between Corbett's book and earlier treatments of classical rhetoric like Brooks and Warren's Modern Rhetoric (1957). Corbett's was a comprehensive - some say "uncompromising" - treatment of invention, arrangement and style which stayed close to the original texts, yet managed to emphasize the utility of the rhetorical principles for student writers. Consequently, this rather scholarly book weathered the liberal reaction of the early 70's and continues to attract a modest yet devout following. More important, because of the lucidity and impact of classical theory as presented by Corbett, every new theory of invention has had to come to terms with the rhetoric of Aristotle.

Then, in 1966 came the Dartmouth Conference, which brought into prominence some important new ideas about the teaching of composition. Several books were engendered by the conference, but two of them, in different ways, became touchstones for the liberal, open-classroom theories which were in full swing by the early 70's. I'll deal first with the line of development suggested by John Dixon's Growth Through English (1967). As his title implies, Dixon's summary of the ideas evolved at the conference has strong ties with the progressive theories of the early 50's and before. "Self-discovery through and in self-expression" was the main concern, and the teacher's role was to facilitate this self-expression by encouraging

the student to respond to a variety of experiences with writing, drama, fiction, poetry, film, and music. This idea of self-discovery through experience with language manifested itself in several textbooks during the next few years, but the most popular was undoubtedly Ken Macrorie's Telling Writing (1970).[10]

Probably no one who read it at the time will ever quite forget Macrorie's first chapter, "The Poison Fish," where he gave a name to "Engfish," that insincere, unfelt student writing that all teachers recognize, dislike and feel guilty about. Macrorie thought students needed help getting in touch with their experience, since their years of English classes had conditioned them to ignore it. He assumed, and was able to demonstrate that if students stopped writing "what the teacher wants" and started trying to get their own point of view across to other students, they would write better. Macrorie's techniques, like his use of free writing, were mainly ways of helping students to see for themselves, to observe life from their own unique perspectives, and thereby discover their own voices as writers. The "fabulous realities" were ways of training that vision, and the "sharpening" exercises were intended to refine it once it was down on paper.

Teachers' and students' responses to Telling Writing made it obvious that Macrorie had touched on something fundamental to the teaching of writing. Telling Writing went into

its second edition in 1976, and many of Macrorie's (and Dixon's) ideas have reappeared, reborn, in William Coles' The Plural I: The Teaching of Writing (1978). Significantly, The Plural I is a description of a writing class Coles taught in the late 60's. Its subject, described by Richard Larson in his foreword to the book, is "growth in and through language: growth in students' power to understand a subject [and] in students' power to find a 'voice' suitable to the work they wish the writing to do."[11] The major difference from Macrorie's books is that The Plural I urges the student to strike out in more directions; typical of our age of multiplicity, the student's self is a plural I - many selves - and the choice of a literary self, or role, is identified as an important part of the composing process.

A different line of development stems from Moffett's Teaching the Universe of Discourse (1968), which builds some of the Dartmouth ideas into a theory of discourse. Basic to this theory is the triangle of relationships between author, audience and subject. "What creates different kinds of discourse," he says, "are shifts in the relations among persons - increasing rhetorical distance between speaker and listener, and increasing abstractive altitude between the raw material of some subject and the speaker's symbolization of it."[12] For example, the relation between first and second person (I-You) is less abstract than that

between first and third person (I-It). Essentially, Moffett distinguished three modes of discourse - drama, fiction and essays. Drama grows out of the I-You relation, and is least abstract; essays, which are written about something derive from the I-It relation, and are most abstract. Moffett speculates that children's development of language skills may actually parallel this sequence as they progress toward managing higher levels of abstractions and become more aware of their power to conceive them.

Moffett's interest in levels of abstraction characterizes an approach that began with Gordon Rohman's Project English experiment at Michigan State and carries on into the present with Ann Berthoff's Forming/Thinking/Writing (1978). In 1965, Rohman reported his conclusions in an article entitled "Pre-Writing: The Stage of Discovery in the Writing Process." He argued that the fundamental act of writing is the "dynamic of conceptualizing." A writer has two contexts to discover, Rohman says, first the "subject" context, i.e. things about a subject, which can be researched, and second (and more crucial), the "personal" context, "that special combination of words which makes an essay his and not yours or mine."[13] Students could enter into this process of discovery by keeping a journal, practicing the discipline of the religious meditation, and experimenting with analogies. All of these exercises were intended to encourage a renewed recognition, or "re-cognizing" of a given subject.

Rohman never claimed that his methods represented a complete course in writing, but he did insist that his "principle of personal transformation ought to be the basic writing experience for all students at all levels, the propaedeutic to all subsequent and more specialized forms of writing."[14] Although Rohman himself did not write a textbook, Donald Stewart, one of his original co-workers, produced a useful text called The Authentic Voice: A Pre-Writing Approach to Student Writing (1972),[15] which adhered faithfully to the principles Rohman described in 1965.

Berthoff's textbook also reflects a basic concern with concept formation, but she gives more attention to the manipulation of abstractions. "Seeing relationships" is the book's working concept of thinking, and Berthoff helps students to develop this kind of imaginative skill through short writing exercises - "occasions for [them] to experience the composing process as a matter of forming concepts, making meaning, finding and creating forms."[16] Perhaps it is symptomatic of our times that Berthoff's treatment of "making meaning" depends much more on the analysis of symbol systems and the conscious ascent and descent of the ladder of abstractions than does Rohman's.

A third direction suggested by the Dartmouth Conference was taken by Robert Zoellner and Peter Elbow, who studied the act of writing as it arose from the writer's interaction with words, ideas and other people. Both of them doubted

what Zoellner called the "mentalistic" or "think-write" model for the composing process, and both insisted that writing is not thought out ahead of time, but produced as part of a behavioral process. Zoellner's "Talk-Write: A Behavioral Pedagogy for Composition" appeared in 1969, filling an entire issue of College English and urging that a student's writing behavior could best be modified by applying an operant conditioning model. What Zoellner meant by writing behavior is best illustrated by one of his own anecdotes from that article:

> The most compelling and suggestive office-interview "happening" occurs when I read the student's utterly opaque and impenetrable sentence or paragraph aloud to him. "Mr. Phillips," I say, "I simply can't make head nor tail out of this paragraph; what in the world were you trying to say?" When I pose this question in this situation, large numbers of students, certainly a majority, respond with a bit of behavior which I suggest may be of immense significance for the teaching of composition. They open their mouths, and they say the thing they were unable to write. "Well, Dr. Zoellner," they usually begin, "all I meant to say in that paragraph was that. . . ," and out it comes, a sustained, articulated, rapid-fire segment of "sound-stream," usually from five

> to fifteen seconds duration, which communicates to me effectively and quickly what they "had in mind" when they produced the impenetrable paragraph I hold in my hand. And all I had to do to elicit this fascinating bit of behavior was to ask them to shift from the scribal modality to the vocal modality.[17]

The quickness of the student's short, exasperated "visceral blurt," as Zoellner called it, meant that the student wouldn't have had time to rethink his badly written paragraph; undoubtedly, he alread had thought it out. The problem seemed to lie not with the thought, but with a faulty, or poorly adapted writing behavior, and here is where Zoellner makes his notorious analogy to the operant conditioning of laboratory rats in a Skinner box. Very simply, Zoellner proposed turning the classroom into a conditioning environment. A student placed at the blackboard would respond vocally to questions, and then immediately write the first part of the response on the board. The other students or the teacher would offer immediate feedback, thereby "shaping" the writing behavior as it took place. Zoellner's theory did not attract a large following, perhaps because the talk-write method seemed an unwieldy technique for classroom use. Ultimately, his most valuable work may turn out to be his eloquent attack on the think-write model of the composing process.[18]

Peter Elbow's Writing Without Teachers (1963) was another assault on the mentalistic model, but while Zoellner wrote about student behavior, Elbow analyzed his own struggle with writing, drawing from it a great deal of practical advice and a few principles. "The common model of writing," he says, "preaches control. It tells me to think first, make up my mind about what I really mean, figure out ahead of time where I am going, have a plan, an outline, don't dither, don't be ambiguous, be stern with myself, don't let things get out of hand."[19] As a result, Elbow reports, he would start out with a sense of satisfaction and control, only to end up not being in control, "feeling stuck, feeling lost, trying to write something and never succeeding." As an antidote to such writing blocks, he suggests a "developmental" model: "Don't worry about what you mean or what you intend ahead of time; you don't need a plan or an outline, let things get out of hand, let things wander and digress."[20] The advantage of this activity, he explains, is that it gets the flow moving; it by-passes the editor in us and gets the process of writing started.

But Elbow's achievement is not so much his developmental model as his practical measures for implementing it. Typical is his section on free writing, useful both for breaking out of a self-critical paralysis and as an aid to invention. Elbow sees free writing as a kind of "growing" -

"a transaction with words, whereby you free yourself from what you presently think, feel, perceive, and make available to yourself something better."[21] A complementary process, which Elbow calls "cooking," concerns the ways in which ideas interact, contrast and conflict, and thereby produce further insights. "Cooking," Elbow explains, is aided by interaction between people, between words and ideas, between metaphors, between modes of writing, and especially between You and those word-symbols on paper. Here again, as with Zoellner, we see the progressive notion of the growth of students' language abilities through interactive learning.

Zoellner and Elbow have focussed more narrowly on the act of writing than most theorists, but still more carefully defined is the work of Francis Christensen and Frank O'Hare, who have concentrated specifically on syntactic development - on the ways in which students' repertoir of syntactic choices may be increased. They assume that since an increased ability to manipulate syntax makes possible a greater variety of syntactical patterns, it may also increase one's facility for expressing and perhaps even creating ideas.

Christensen's article on "The Generative Rhetoric of the Sentence" appeared in 1963. It reflects those times in his belief that some grammar study is indispensable if a student and teacher are to discuss writing with any precision. But Christensen's theory itself was process-oriented,

based on the principles of addition and direction of movement. In good prose, he was convinced, a series of sentence modifiers tends to follow the main clause, sustaining its impact, qualifying and enriching its meaning. A third principle had to do with levels of generality: the main clause is likely to be stated in general or abstract terms, but with the main clause completed, "the forward movement of the sentence stops, and the writer shifts down to a lower level of generality or abstraction and goes back over the same ground at this level."[22] To demonstrate these shifts, Christensen diagrammed the sentences in layers, numbering each sentence modifier according to its level of generality. Then, having identified the various kinds of modifiers as well as the ways in which they were linked and subordinated in levels, he was able to show how students could use them to build their own "cumulative sentences."

The full import of Christensen's work became apparent in 1969 when John Mellon produced his monograph on The Use of Transformational Sentence Combining for Enhancing the Development of Syntactic Fluency in English Composition.[23] While Christensen had concentrated primarily on adding sentence modifiers to main clauses, Mellon showed how students could be taught, step by step, to build a variety of sentence structures by means of the transformations. Then in 1973, Frank O'Hare published his Sentence Combining: Improving Student Writing Without the Use of Formal Grammar

Instruction, which became the basis for our current sentence-combining pedagogy.

The reason sentence-combining has caught on so quickly, of course, is that it increases the syntactic maturity of students' writing; that is, it helps them write longer and more sophisticated clause structures. In retrospect, therefore, it is interesting to read O'Hare's remarks on the relationship of sentence combining to the composing process. First he notes Richard Young's definition of style (from Rhetoric: Discovery and Change) as "the characteristic route the writer takes through all the choices presented in both the writing and pre-writing stages" - a definition in which invention and arrangement become, in a general sense, aspects of style. And style, O'Hare has shown, can best be shaped through sentence-combining. But O'Hare's own conclusion is a more conservative one: "The attractiveness of the sentence-combing signals in the present study lies in their simplicity, their flexibility, and their practicality. . . . With the threat of grammatical failure removed, the developing writer can get on with solving sentence structure problems and confidently face the real issue - that of blending form and idea in any given rhetorical situation."[24]

Another extension of Christensen's work is Frank D'Angelo's A Conceptual Theory of Rhetoric (1975).[25] The title suggests an affinity with Rohman's work on concept

formation, but in fact, D'Angelo's treatment of concepts owes more to the Aristotelian topics. The heart of D'Angelo's book is rather his discussion of "syntagmatic" and "paradigmatic" methods for analyzing essays, methods which are closely related to Christensen's techniques for sentence and paragraph analysis. For example, the syntagmatic analysis operates by distinguishing levels of generality, while the paradigmatic analysis isolates kernel sentences, instances of semantic or syntactic repetition, which create a "conceptual" pattern for the essay. If, as D'Angelo claims, these paradigms are "dynamic organizational processes," and not merely static conventional patterns, they may be useful as heuristic devices for helping students shape their ideas for an essay.

But the writer who has brought the term "heuristic" into common use in the last decade is Richard Young, whose Rhetoric: Discovery and Change (1970),[26] co-authored with Alton Becker and Kenneth Pike, was based on Pike's tagmemic linguistics. Its focus, however, is squarely on invention, the discovery and change (or development) of ideas about a subject. Like all theories of invention, Young's theory requires a process view of composing, but unlike classical invention, it is not merely an aid for locating arguments; primarily, it's a method of problem solving, which Young developed within the college of Engineering at the University of Michigan for use in what we might call technical

writing classes. In Young's words, tagmemic invention "is designed to help the writer carry out three activities when confronted with a problematic experience: 1) Retrieval of relevant information already known, 2) Analysis of problematic data, and 3) Discovery of new concepts and ordering principles."[27]

The core of Young's theory is his heuristic device, the so-called tagmemic matrix, a set of perspectives from which a subject may be viewed. What, for instance, are the contrastive features of the subject? What is its range of variation? What is its distribution in larger contexts? By combining six of these perspectives in the form of a chart, Young generates nine possible ways of analyzing the data. By revealing information which was probably not evident to the writer at first, these questions lead the writer into a deeper understanding of the data.

Various writers have criticized Young's matrix for its complexity, its abstractness, and the redundancy of some of its categories. Such objections can probably be overlooked in view of the overall usefulness of the device - it is, as some say, a powerful eye-opener. A more interesting objection is that this heuristic is useful mainly for empirical analysis, the analysis of things, as opposed to the exploration of ideas.[28]

Nevertheless, other systems of invention are also "tuned" to certain kinds of thinking about experience, and

the same is true of a fourth system, and my last topic, Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Method. The basis of this method is Burke's pentad of heuristic probes - act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose - which he devised for the analysis of human motives. "Any complete statement about motives," Burke has said, "will offer some kind of answers to these five questions: what was done (act), when or where it was done (scene), who did it (agent), how he did it (agency), and why (purpose.)"[29]

These five questions bear an obvious resemblance to the well-known journalistic check-list - who, what, where, when, how and why - and many teachers use the two methods interchangeably. Burke himself has said, however, that his intended stress is less upon the terms themselves than on what he would call the "ratios" among the terms. For example, "insofar as men's actions are to be interpreted in terms of the circumstances in which they are acting, their behavior would fall under the heading of a 'scene-act' ratio. But insofar as their acts reveal their different characters, their behavior would fall under the heading of an 'agent-act' ratio."[30]

As Young has pointed out, the pentad, as a heuristic device, is useful for "discovering the essential features of the behavior of groups or individuals." Indeed, while Young's matrix is an effective aid to empirical analysis, Burke's pentad is particularly helpful in dealing with just

those notions which are not empirically verifiable. As Philip Keith has written, it is the advantage of Burke's system, that it deals with "abstractions, opinions, probabilities, and intentions, in sum, with those kinds of language that have traditionally been the concern of rhetoric and dialectic as opposed to science."[31]

I conclude with Kenneth Burke's theory not because it is new, but because it is new to teachers of writing, and its implications for composition are still being worked out. In fact, if we were to speculate about where composition is now headed, we couldn't say much about new theories when the newest textbooks are still being shaped by ideas from the Dartmouth Conference. Instead, we'd talk about ways of extending and putting into practice our new research on language and language behavior - the comparative studies of oral and written speech, studies of reading, error analysis, cognition, learning and memory.[32] Fifteen years ago, Albert Kitzhaber feared that better teaching at the high school level would embarrass the colleges. Let's hope that our present research, focussing on the composing process at all grade levels, can create a chain of cooperative effort that will stretch from Kindergarten to the graduate schools.

NOTES

[1]Arthur N. Applebee, Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History (Urbana, Ill.: NCTE, 1974), pp. 143-4, and Ch. 6, passim.

[2]The English Language Arts in the Secondary School. NCTE Curriculum Series, Vol. 3 (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956).

[3]Albert R. Kitzhaber, Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963, pp. 95-6.

[4]John Dixon, Growth Through English: A Report Based on the Dartmouth Conference 1966 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967).

[5]Elizabeth McPherson, "Composition," The Teaching of English, The Seventy-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, ed. James R. Squire (Chicago: NSSE, 1977), pp. 178-88.

[6] See Daniel Fogarty, Roots for a New Rhetoric (New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1959), p. 118; Robert Zoellner, "Response: Mentalizing S. R. Rodent," College English, 31 (1969), 215-30; Richard E. Young, "Problems and

Paradigms: Needed Research in Rhetorical Invention," Research on Composing: Points of Departure, ed. Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell (Urbana, Ill.: NCTE, 1978), pp. 30-3.

[7]Richard E. Young, "Problems and Paradigms," p. 31.

[8]See J. Stephen Sherwin, Four Problems in Teaching English: A Critique of Research (Scranton, Penn.: International Textbook Co., 1969), pp. 116-35.

[9]Edward P. J. Corbett, Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965).

[10]Ken Macrorie, Telling Writing (Rochelle Park, N. J.: Hayden, 1970).

[11]William E. Coles, Jr., The Plural I: The Teaching of Writing (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978), p. viii.

[12]James Moffett, Teaching the Universe of Discourse (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1968), p. 11.

[13]D. Gordon Rohman, "Pre-Writing: The Stage of Discovery in the Writing Process," College Composition and Communication, 16 (1965), 108.

[14]Ibid., 112.

[15]Donald C. Stewart, The Authentic Voice: A Pre-Writing

Approach to Student Writing (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, 1972).

[16]Ann E. Berthoff, Forming/Thinking/Writing: The Composing Imagination (Rochelle Park, N. J.: Hayden, 1978), p. 2.

[17]Robert Zoellner, "Talk-Write: A Behavioral Pedagogy for Composition," College English, 30 (1969), 273.

[18]See also Zoellner's "Response: Mentalizing S. R. Rodent," College English, 31 (1969), 215-30.

[19]Peter Elbow, Writing Without Teachers (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 32.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Ibid., p. 49.

[22]Francis Christensen, "A Generative Rhetoric of the Sentence," College Composition and Communication, 14 (1963), 157.

[23]John C. Mellon, The Use of Transformational Sentence-Combining for Enhancing the Development of Syntactic Fluency in English Composition, NCTE Research Report no. 10 (Urbana, Ill.: NCTE, 1969).

[24]Frank O'Hare, Sentence Combining: Improving Student

Writing Without Formal Grammar Instruction, NCTE Research Report no. 15 (Urbana, Ill.: NCTE, 1973), p. 76.

[25]Frank J. D'Angelo, A Conceptual Theory of Rhetoric (Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop, 1975).

[26]Richard E. Young, Alton L. Becker, and Kenneth L. Pike, Rhetoric: Discovery and Change (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1970).

[27]Young, "Problems and Paradigms," pp. 38-9.

[28]Susan Wells, "Classroom Heuristics and Empiricism," College English, 39 (1977), 467-76.

[29]Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives (New York: George Braziller, 1955), p. x.

[30]Kenneth Burke, "Questions and Answers About the Pentad," College Composition and Communication, 29 (1978), 332. Burke quotes this passage from his article on "Dramatism" in The International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences.

[31]Philip M. Keith, "Burkeian Invention, from Pentad to Dialectic," ERIC Resources in Education, March, 1979, CS 204 343, p. 1.

[32]A good overview of contemporary research on composition and its related fields is provided by Charles R. Cooper

and Lee Odell, eds., Research on Composing: Points of Departure (Urbana, Ill.: NCTE, 1978).